

it is impossible to see how that body can maintain the position it has taken. The only reasonable explanation of its extraordinary action is one hardly creditable to it, viz., that it did not inquire into or understand the force of the statute in question before voting on it. This explanation is but a sorry one at best, but friends of education will, I hope, more readily believe that the Senate has made a blunder than that it has deliberately determined to repudiate its own record and to materially lower its pass standard.

There are also other serious complications. The French and German courses were increased in 1890, when each of these subjects was made equal to Greek, in order to avoid all possible cause of complaint. These courses still stand unrevised. By the *volte-face* of last month each of them has only half the value as compared with Greek which it had when the curriculum was framed. The Senate declares in 1891 that its conclusions of 1890 were wrong by 50 per cent., a very serious admission for a body which might be expected to have some regard for its own reputation. Moreover, students of Orientals, who by the 1890 curriculum were allowed to combine Greek and Hebrew, now find themselves in the unfortunate position of being obliged to take Hebrew, if at all, as an extra subject for which they get no credit. In fact the whole situation is so indefensible from every point of view that the Senate cannot possibly leave the curriculum in its present condition. An early re-revision may be looked for.

3. The present position and prospects of Greek.

Professor Hutton in his article admits (p. 87) that the numbers in pass Greek in the University have fallen off some fifty per cent. in ten years, and for this unfortunate condition of affairs he blames the

option which has existed now for some years between Greek, French and German. Pass Greek is evidently in civil case, *in extremis* as it were, but the curriculum is not to blame, at least so think some of the more enlightened classical men, as I shall presently show. If pass Greek is to be saved, its friends had better inquire into the nature of its malady rather than occupy themselves in forcing from the Senate by surprise or strategy a certificate of health and vigour which do not exist. At any rate dissolution will not be delayed for long by a malicious attempt to cripple a vigorous but inoffensive neighbour. No adjustment of the curriculum can avail to save a subject which after three years of preparation (see p. 46) and four years in college leaves the student such meagre permanent results. As to suggestions for saving the life of the unfortunate moribund, I shall not offer my own advice, but I commend to the thoughtful consideration of Professor Hutton and the other friends of pass Greek the following brief quotations from recent articles in this magazine on this very theme, from two of the most distinguished and successful classical teachers in Ontario. These quotations indicate more clearly than I should dare to do the nature of the malady and the hope of cure. Mr. Fairclough, Lecturer on Greek, University College, says in Sept., 1890: "Of late years great improvements have been made in our schools and colleges in the position and teaching of modern languages . . . the teachers and professors of French and German have shown such enterprise and enthusiasm, and have made such progress in methods of instruction that their Latin and Greek brethren, who used to turn up their classical noses with scorn at anything Teutonic or Romance, now humbly crave pardon and sue for pedagogical enlight-